Emergency services sector update

THE POWER OF BEING UNDERSTOOD
AUDIT | TAX | CONSULTING

RSM

Contents

Introduction

Welcome to RSM's latest emergency services sector briefing which provides a useful source of insight into recent developments and publications affecting the sector.

We look at Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Constabulary (HMCIC), Sir Thomas Winsor's overview of the findings of inspections conducted over the last year, delve into the planned programme of inspections for 2018/19, and consider development of the fire and rescue service inspection framework. We also draw attention to some of the key statistics published across the sector including, data on crime outcomes and fire and rescue incidents. In addition, we shed light on the Home Office's proposal to allow police and crime commissioners to sit and vote on combined fire and rescue authorities, following its consultation exercise.

Along with our summary of key publications, we consider collaboration assurance. We set out our approach to the development of a collaboration assurance framework (CAF), which involves creating an explicit reporting tool known as the collaboration assurance statement (CAS). We also provide an example of how 4questionnaires and 4action modules from RSM's proprietary Governance, Risk, Compliance software, Insight4GRC (www.insight4GRC.com) could be of benefit to your organisation.

We hope you find this update a useful source of insight. As ever, if you have any queries, or have any suggestions for topics for future editions, please contact either myself, or your usual RSM contact and we will be delighted to help.

Daniel Harris
National Head of Emergency Services and Local Government

The dark art of collaboration assurance

In 2001/2002 I became 'magician in chief' and designed, developed and established a local government consortium that included five councils and a private sector partner. We had a common goal: deliver better customer services without increasing our budget.

It was not easy, but we achieved what we set out to do. And we received some accolades along the way. The then ODPM strategic partnering taskforce used our case as an example of best practice. And the exercise paved the way for a lot more discussions amongst the councils involved about what other services might be shared or collaborated on.

Since then, collaboration in its various guises has become a more common feature across the public sector landscape. At the same time, the arrival of alternative delivery vehicles, such as standalone entities or public entity controlled companies with various partners, means collaboration has become increasingly complex.

For audit committee members, this presents new challenges. A key concern among those I regularly talk to is how to oversee collaborations and gain a required level of assurance that risks and resources are being well managed. To place this in context, one organisation identified that approximately one third of its budget would be allocated to financing collaborations. Gaining assurance in this area was therefore both material and important.

In all cases, discussions turned to how internal audit could be used as a third line of assurance or defence. But this wasn't a perfect solution. In many cases, there was often no joined–up approach to obtaining assurances in the first place, with various organisations taking the lead in a collaboration, often with different internal audit providers, all of varying quality and approach.

It was also recognised that internal audit in itself would need to be directed to the areas of greatest risk and/or concern to make best use of their resources. And that the traditional internal audit coverage and reporting cycle may not be as timely as might be required for assurance purposes by one or more of the partners.

More recently the conversation has focused on how to establish collaboration assurance arrangements that will benefit all parties involved ie audit committee members, managers of the collaboration and ultimately the tax payer and customer.

Against this backdrop, picture five audit committee chairs and their respective S151 officers looking to me for that solution. What follows, by way of a case study, is what we at RSM did and what RSM have done since to meet their needs and move forward the collaboration assurance approach. You are quite welcome to steal anything that you feel might be beneficial, or, contact me and I will happily elaborate further. After all, isn't that what collaboration is all about?

The development of the Collaboration Assurance Framework (CAF)

The five organisations were involved in 15 high–priority collaborations, ranging from back office through to direct customer support and tactical service provision. RSM carried out an initial assessment of the collaboration governance arrangements via a workshop involving all organisation stakeholders. We were then asked to help to design, develop and roll–out a collaboration assurance framework that could be used across all collaborations now and in the future.

The design and development stage involved the creation of an explicit assurance reporting tool – the collaboration assurance statement (CAS). This focused on eight areas of business risk under the management of the collaboration, including:

1. progress of the collaboration business / operational plan;

2. ownership and execution of process, controls and actions;

3. management of business risk;

4. integrity of decision making;

5. robustness of collaboration governance;

6. reliability and relevance of performance information, both financial and non–financial;

7. best use of assets including people, IT and physical assets ie buildings and equipment; and

8. how collaboration outcomes contribute to the objectives of the sponsoring organisations.

Under each of the above headings we defined a set of explicit controls, or requirements on which the collaboration then had to make an assessment as to their effectiveness. In doing so we required the collaboration management or lead to explicitly identify whether they were relying on first, second or third lines of defence/assurance and what these were.

First line was defined as assurance provided directly from collaboration management itself ie their view, knowledge and understanding drawn from managing the collaboration business on a day–to–day basis and the checks and balances that they apply.

Second line was assurance obtained from other sources within the collaboration or sponsor organisations, this might be some form of overview or additional checks and balances that compliment those of the first line i.e. finance review of budget submissions or scrutiny by any existing forum that was set up to govern the collaboration.

Third line assurance was from those sources independent of the collaboration that may have been provided or commissioned.

This created a point of reference in the form of assurance evidence.

Then, and perhaps most importantly, based on the assurance evidence gathered, we required the collaboration management to provide an assurance judgement for each control or requirement as follows:

- **full** – the collaboration meets the criteria fully and completely and this can be demonstrated / evidenced;

- **partially** – the collaboration partially meets the criteria and / or can only partially demonstrate / evidence this; and

- **none** – unable to confirm that the collaboration meets the criteria and / or is unable to demonstrate / evidence this.

Where the effectiveness assessment highlighted a need for improvement, the collaboration was required to identify the action that would be taken to strengthen the control or meet the requirement, by who and when. The CAS completion also required the collaboration management to take a view as to the likelihood of their effectiveness judgement changing in the next three to six months, why this might occur and the likely impact on the collaboration, considering both negative and positive events or circumstances. In their reporting, the collaboration management were not just considering the current state but looking ahead and anticipating control risk via the potential future state.

The challenges involved just getting to this stage cannot be underestimated. In this case there were lengthy debates over the focus of the CAS and I am sure this could be / will be refined further by any organisation that adopts this or a similar approach (I'll be interested to hear).

We now faced the deployment challenges. For example, do we deploy to all collaborations and if so how do we deploy – all at once, using a pilot Collaboration or in phases? After all, despite the collaboration conversations being had at sponsor level, these conversations did not necessarily involve all the collaborations themselves. RSM therefore suggested that a CAS pilot, with one collaboration, should be undertaken allowing us to safely road test the approach developed and fine-tune this as required. We picked a collaboration that had been in existence for a while and that was relatively stable based on what was known. Work commenced with an engagement meeting involving the entire collaboration management team. This was important as we wanted the collaboration management to feel that this was something shared collectively so that we might obtain a more reliable outcome. We explained the background, what we were aiming to achieve and what we expected of them. We agreed that the collaboration would complete the CAS within a two-week window and send their conclusions back to us for initial review before arranging what we described as a "check and challenge" session ie to scrutinise and substantiate further the CAS responses provided and judgements reached. The downside was that at the time we deployed the CAS via Microsoft Office (of which more later).

CAS Pilot Learning
So, what were the key learning points from the CAS pilot?

• how useful the collaboration management team felt the exercise was, especially as they did set aside time to work through the CAS together. They told us that it made them reflect on what they had in place and what could be improved upon. They particularly enjoyed the face-to-face "challenge" session that RSM facilitated with regard to their management of risk and controls.

• The improvement action plan was something they recognised and felt they would take forward as part of their sponsor discussions. All the S151 Officers felt that it provided a level of accountability that had not previously existed.

• The CAS coverage was considered appropriate – it conveyed to the collaboration what was being required from an assurance perspective, it uncovered areas of weakness, as well as provided visibility and a consistent approach, which had been agreed by all participants in the CAS process. We knew that it could be deployed across all collaborations. The Audit Committee Chairs and S151 Officers would get the assurance visibility they were looking for.

• There was a desire to undertake completion of the CAS at least annually with an in-year follow up / update, including the six-month forward look, to anticipate changes that might impact on the collaboration.

• We needed to automate the CAS completion. The Microsoft Office approach had become administratively burdensome, especially if we were repeating this across 15 collaborations, as well as extracting key matters for the attention of the S151 and audit committee, let alone ensuring that actions planned and approved could be progressed. And all this on top of ensuring proper version control. But we already had a solution in mind in the form of RSM's Insight4GRC platform (www.insight4grc.com).

So where are we now?

We haven't changed the CAS significantly — we know the approach works, and we have subsequently rolled this out across other collaborations. But we have automated the approach making use of the RSM Insight4GRC platform (www.insight4grc.com).

For those of you that are not familiar with Insight4GRC, this is an RSM proprietary software package, accessed via a web-browser, to help organisations better manage their governance, risk and compliance (or control) environment. More than 250 organisations already benefit from using one, some or all of the suite, including PLCs and not for profit, amongst them many local councils and police forces. In the case of the CAS automation we made use of the 4questionnaires and 4action modules from the Insight4GRC suite. The two modules when combined provide for powerful data gathering, assessment, reporting and monitoring but most of all it represents a sustainable and efficient mechanism for on-going CAS access, up-dating and completion by each of the Collaborations. Each collaboration has access to their own GRC performance reporting dashboard coupled with a central view for sponsors enabling them to drill down and interrogate further the underlying controls and assurance evidence that each collaboration has provided.

4questionnaire

We have built the CAS in 4questionnaires.

4questionnaires is a flexible and intelligent system that facilitates the gathering of data and analysis to provide insightful management information.

The advantages of using 4questionaires included:

• flexible configuration of questionnaires allowing for the customisation and setup of questionnaires, (in this case the CAS), efficiently and effectively;

• ability to analyse and interpret answers and create impact assessments and action plans stemming from the CAS;

• controlled and targeted distribution and allocation of the CAS to individuals and the ability to track questionnaire completion by collaborations; and

• ability to upload documentary evidence with the CAS responses, as well as providing a full audit trail of entries made.

4action

The improvement plans that emerged as a result of the CAS completion were uploaded and tracked via 4action.

4action has extensive reporting facilities and the ability to set target dates for the individuals responsible for actions, it helps ensure administrators have a complete picture of the status of all agreed tasks and recommendations.

The use of 4action brought clear benefits to the future CAS use through the increased focus on the implementation of agreed actions. These benefits include:

• greater likelihood that the collaboration objectives will be achieved;

• greater likelihood of implementing improvement actions stemming from the CAS completion or recommendations stemming from reviews by internal audit etc. at the collaboration;

• better management of actions across the collaboration and the encouragement of accountability;

• up to date management information on key actions and individual as well as collaboration performance;

• large efficiency savings in action and recommendation monitoring; and

• ease of reporting for a wide range of different collaboration audiences with different information needs.

And of course, there is no reliance on RSM (or any other third party) to facilitate the CAS process. Once the automated approach via Insight4GRC is established and the system administration determined it can be managed and run by the organisations involved, whether sponsors, collaborations, or both.

What have we learned?
- We know that collaborative working will continue to grow, will involve wider agencies and become more complex.

- We understand, based on our experiences of working with local councils, police and fire, that gaining appropriate and timely collaboration assurance remains a challenge. We suspect that many collaboration assurance arrangements are still inconsistent, ineffective or inefficient.

- We know that our CAS approach works and, when coupled with the Insight4GRC software, provides for a robust proposition that organisations looking to strengthen or make more efficient their existing collaboration assurance can take advantage of.

Your collaboration assurance considerations
So finally, some questions that you may need to consider after reading the above:

1 What is your approach to collaboration assurance?

2 How reliable is your collaboration assurance approach?

3 How does your collaboration assurance approach make use of first, second and third lines of assurance?

4 How have you formalised the assurance approach to make it a visible and recognisable collaboration assurance framework?

5 How does the audit committee feel about the level of assurance it gets in connection with collaborations?

6 How are you making use of technology to efficiently obtain, make visible and measure your collaboration or wider assurances?

7 How can you improve your collaboration assurance?

If you would like to know more about collaboration assurance, the CAS and/or the Insight4GRC suite (**www.insight4grc.com**) then please contact Matt Humphrey on **matthew.humphrey@rsmuk.com** or 07711 960 728

Technical Update

Police

State of Policing: The Annual Assessment of Policing in England and Wales 2017

Sir Thomas Winsor, Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Constabulary (HMCIC), has published his 'annual assessment of policing in England and Wales 2017.' The report provides an overview of the findings of Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services' (HMICFRS') inspections conducted over the last year, including its police effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy (PEEL) inspections, youth offending services inspections and child protection inspections.

Overall, the PEEL inspections outcomes were relatively positive. Effectiveness inspections saw nine forces graded higher than in the previous year while five forces had deteriorated, receiving a lower grade than they had previously. Inspections on efficiency and legitimacy showed that grades remained the same for 32 forces while four had improved their grade and six had a worse grade than in last year's inspections.

Questions for committee's consideration

• Are you receiving assurance that your force has reviewed its results, analysed its position and is taking the appropriate and timely actions?

• Does the force fully understand the link between demand and capability and do its workforce plans reflect this?

• Are you sighted on the digital transformation agenda?

• Does the force have effective arrangements in place to monitor and report on benefits realisation from the digital transformation agenda?

In the State of Policing report, HMICFRS has recommended that forces take action on workforce skills which involves forces needing to better understand the link between demand and capability. It has also been recommended that forces take action on digital transformation to improve police efficiency. Yet overall, inspections have shown there have been improvements to the police services effectiveness and efficiency. Forces have generally made progress on the recommendations set out by HMICFRS which HMCIC has described as 'encouraging', although it is understandable that some changes to come into effect may take some time. In relation to the inspections carried out on child protection, on the whole it was seen that police staff are evidently committed to 'improving the protection of vulnerable children.' Forces had shown to have made good progress in achieving better outcomes for children who were at risk of harm.

The report also provides an overview of the changes HMICFRS will implement when undertaking its PEEL inspections for 2018/19 and beyond. PEEL inspections will see a more 'integrated approach' leading to an improved assessment of forces, due to the information provided in the force management statement (discussed overleaf). HMICFRS will use the information submitted to get a better understanding of how 'well prepared forces are to meet future demands.' Moving forward, HMICFRS is developing an online publicly available register which will allow it to track the progress forces are making with the recommendations given by the inspectorate. HMICFRS have also outlined changes being made to the 'national child protection inspections' which are necessary to address 'new and emerging risks to children.'

Within its State of Policing report, HMICFRS has provided a collation of the 420 reports that have been published between 24 March 2017 and 31 March 2018.

Questions for committee's consideration

• How do you track the HMICFRS actions internally and how does assurance around the implementation filter through to the Audit Committee?

• How does the HMICFRS assurance link in with other assurance providers across the Force — with internal audit / external audit etc in order to ensure assurance is maximised and duplication is minimised?

Force management statements

HMICFRS expects to receive an annual force management statement (FMS) prepared by chief constables. The statement consists of the chief constable's explanation of the demand their force is facing over the following four years, and those ways in which the force will change and improve its workforce and other assets to deal with that demand. It also sets out how the force will make progress on its efficiency to ensure the 'gap between future demand and future capability is as small as it can be' and 'the money the force expects to do all this.'

Developing the force management statement is a three-year process; the first force management statements submitted in May 2018 were part of a pilot year approach. All forces are expected to have reliable information on their current and future demand, assets and resources, and provide the 'best available information in their force management statements' each year. The information will inform HMICFRS's inspections of forces' efficiency and effectiveness, shape the inspectorates approach for 2019, and help to identify those areas presenting the greatest risk from force activity. This will in turn inform HMICFRS on what future inspections are needed and how intensive they will need to be.

Questions for committee's consideration

- Have Audit Commitee members been briefed on the purpose and content of the first FMS?

- Have you considered how this statement could be used in the future by the Committee and how this links to your terms of reference and remit?

Police inspection programme and framework

HMICFRS has published its police inspection programme for 2018/19. HMICFRS will conduct a range of inspections which include:

- PEEL assessments, which the inspectorate will complete in a more 'integrated' way and will use force management statements as a source of evidence;

- national thematic inspections focusing on fraud, hate crime, older people in the justice system, child protection, counter-terrorism, cyber-crime, and crime data;

- national agencies and non-Home Office force inspections including inspections on the British Transport Police, Ministry of Defence Police and Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs; and

- joint inspections, whereby HMICFRS will work collaboratively with Ofsted and the Care Quality Commission to inspect ways in which local authorities, police and health services work together.

Police forces save £273m on equipment cost

Police forces have saved £237m in three years on equipment costs such as police helmets and vehicles resulting in more money to be spent on local priorities. The majority of savings from this year's statistics arise from the Collaborative Law Enforcement Programme (CLEP), identifying opportunities for collaboration. Dave Thompson, Chief Constable, stated that 'we have already delivered substantial procurement savings and have identified another £100 million of savings over the next three years. While there are considerable challenges to overcome in more complex areas of procurement, we continue to work hard to find further efficiencies and provide the best possible service to the public.' Whilst Nick Hurd, Minister for Police and Fire, has congratulated the service on its 'impressive progress... numbers show that the work is not complete.'

Questions for committee's consideration

- Do you receive timely assurance that the force has explored ways of making procurement efficiencies, including collaborative procurement?

Crime outcomes

The Home Office has published data for police recorded crime outcomes in England and Wales for the year to December 2017. The data shows 'what outcomes police forces assigned to offences recorded', 'all crime outcomes that were assigned by police forces' and 'crimes recorded in the year that were later transferred to another police force or cancelled.'

Key statistics for the year to December 2017 include:

- forces had assigned 47 per cent of offences as 'investigation complete — no suspect identified';

- 18.4 per cent of offences as 'evidential difficulties (victim does not support action)';

- 9.1 per cent of offences as charged or summonsed;

- 2.6 per cent of offences as 'out of court (informal)'; and

- 3 per cent (150,386) of the 4,955,752 offences initially recorded were transferred or cancelled.

Police and fire

Enabling police and crime commissioners to sit and vote on combined fire and rescue authorities

The Home Office has published a response to its consultation on 'enabling police and crime commissioners [PCCs] to sit and vote on combined fire and rescue authorities [FRAs]' in effect, utilising the representation model. There were a total of 67 responses, 22 of which were from representatives of FRAs. 91 per cent (20) of FRAs agreed with the 'proposed amendments to the combination schemes of Combined FRAs established or continued in existence under sections 2 and 4 of the 2004 Fire and Rescue Services Act.' 9 per cent (2) FRAs had objected to the proposed amendments.

Themes emerging from the consultation from FRAs seeking further information or those objecting the proposed amendments included:

• political balance and membership numbers — it was noted that 'adding the PCC as a member could have an impact on political balance where there is more than one constituent authority';

• membership allowance – some respondents underlined that they were 'under pressure to reduce FRA membership' as a means to demonstrate savings and were as a result, 'reluctant to increase the number of members to accommodate the PCC'; and

• 'extending the right to a PCC to appoint a deputy PCC to attend FRA meetings where the PCC is unable to' — there was some concerns from FRAs that the deputy police and crime commissioner (DPCC) may influence decisions despite them not having a right to vote.

Moving forward, the government will proceed by drafting a 'negative statutory instrument' to amend the combination scheme of those FRAs who support the proposed amendments. They will also launch an inquiry to understand the views of those FRAs who had opposed the proposed amendments.

New hub for emergency services to share information

Organisations across the emergency services sector, including the Royal Society for Public Health, Public Health England, and the National Fire Chiefs Council, have collectively developed a new emergency services hub providing a range of resources to ambulance, fire and rescue and police services. The new hub aims to share public health best practice and improve information and cooperation through resources such as blog posts, guidance materials and case studies.

Fire

Fire and rescue incident statistics

The Home Office has published 'fire and rescue incident statistics' in England for the year ending December 2017.Key statistics include:

• fire and rescue services (FRSs) attended 563,527 incidents compared to 560,874 in the previous year. This was a 34 per cent decrease compared to 2006/07 where FRSs attended 854,371 incidents;

• of all incidents attended, 30 per cent were fire incidents (39 per cent in 2006/07), 30 per cent were non-fire incidents (19 per cent in 2006/07) and 40 per cent (41 per cent in 2006/07) were fire false alarms, which remained to be the largest incident type;

• FRSs attended 169,588 fires, an increase of 4 per cent (162,427) from last year. This represents a 50 per cent decrease from 2006/07 where FRSs attended 336,233 fires. Of the 169,588 fires attended, 74,667 were primary fires, 91,040 were secondary fires and 3,881 were chimney fires;

• FRSs attended 223,383 fire false alarms, a 37 per cent decline compared to a decade ago (352,136);

• FRSs attended 170,556 non-fire incidents. Generally, there has been a decline in the number of non-fire incidents, however, in the last couple of years this has been rising due to an increase in the number of medical incidents attended by FRSs. In the year ending December 2017, 36,799 of the 170,556 non-fire incidents attended by FRSs were medical incident related; and

• there was in total 321 fire related fatalities, a rise of 15 per cent compared to last year (225). 71 of the 321 fatalities were from the Grenfell Tower fire tragedy.

Questions for committee's consideration

• Are you satisfied that your statistics are in line with national trends, and if not, do you have mechanisms to ensure the outlying areas are investigated and action taken?

Developing fire and rescue service inspections

HMICFRS has published a report on developing FRS inspections. It explains how HMICFRS has adapted its approach to take account of learning and feedback from services including what was learnt from the three pilot inspections between March and May 2018. The inspectorate outlines those areas where it tested and improved its approaches, including: taking its 'police inspection technique of reviewing case files and evolving it into process reviews' helping the inspectorate to gain a deeper understanding of how FRSs undertake 'prevention/protection activity'; ensuring the chief fire officer is interviewed prior to the conclusion of fieldwork; and testing varying approaches designed to further involve trained staff, given the vitally important role they play.

The report also includes what HMICFRS has learned from the public and sector consultations that were ran on the 'inspection programme and framework, methodology and judgement criteria.'

HMICFRS received 65 responses to its draft inspection programme and framework consultation, which ran between December 2017 and February 2018. Overall, respondents were generally happy with the inspectorate's approach, yet highlighted areas where further information could be provided. There were several themes emerging, including: funding; the impact of inspections; and consideration of the wider context in which FRSs are operating, including collaborations. Following feedback, HMICFRS had made a number of minor amendments to the documents.

HMICFRS received 27 responses on its judgment criteria consultation, which ran between April and May 2018. Several key themes emerged, including: the judgement criteria was 'ambiguous and open to interpretation'; graded criteria should show examples that reflect service practices; and how the criteria aligns with the new national framework document. Respondents were generally supportive of the criteria, however, HMICFRS has made some small changes to address the issues raised.

The report also sets out what FRSs can expect from HMICFRS inspections.

Updated Fire and Rescue National Framework

The Home Office has published an updated Fire and Rescue National Framework for England following a consultation on proposed changes between December 2017 and February 2018. The changes in the new Framework include:

- new guidance on ways in which fire and rescue authorities (FRAs) should work with the National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) and HMICFRS;

- legislative changes which enable PCCs and mayors to take on responsibility for their local FRS (where a case is made); and

- a section on how FRAs can develop the skills of their people.

Nick Hurd, Minister for Policing and the Fire Service, stated 'the national framework provides the basis for how fire and rescue services in England should operate. The revised version... should support them becoming more accountable, effective and professional than ever before and embed the government's reform programme.' The Framework came into effect on 1 June 2018.

Government announces new standards for fire and rescue services

In the aim to improving FRS professional standards Nick Hurd has announced a new Fire Standards Board approach, which will be established to ensure 'standards are nationally coordinated to a high level across the sector.'

The National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC), Local Government Association and other partners have collaboratively developed the proposal which will be independent from the government. It will be for the Board to establish its workplan but preliminary issues the Board could consider include:

- development and leadership workforce issues;

- identifying and mitigating risks; and

- preventing fire but also ensuring public protection from other emergencies.

It will also be for the Board to agree priorities in response to the Hackitt review, the Grenfell Tower inquiry, and other issues facing fire and rescue services that comes to light.

Independent Review of Building Regulations and Fire Safety

Dame Judith Hackitt has published her final report on the 'Independent Review of Building Regulations and Fire Safety.' The report sets out the 'principles for a new regulatory framework' which is intended to produce a 'simple and effective mechanism for driving building safety', 'provide stronger oversight of duty holders with incentives for the right behaviours, and effective sanctions for poor performance' and 'reassert the role of residents.'

Following the interim report, some progress has been made on the recommendations set out, including a consultation on 'restricting or banning the use of desktop studies as a way of assessing the fire performance of external cladding systems.'

The final report makes recommendations relating to 'the key parameters of a new regulatory framework', which involves a new Joint Competent Authority consisting of Local Authority Building Standards, FRAs and the Health and Safety Executive to oversee better management of safety risks in multi-occupancy higher risk residential buildings. The approach will allow these bodies to work collaboratively to more 'rigorously assess' the safety of buildings and produce a more 'unified and consistent intervention process.' There are also recommendations regarding clearer roles and responsibilities throughout the design and construction process and during occupation, ways in which residents can express their thoughts and producing a more 'robust and transparent construction products regime.'

Sources of further information

HMICFRS
'State of Policing — The Annual Assessment of Policing in England and Wales 2017'
https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/wp-content/uploads/state-of-policing-2017-2.pdf

HMICFRS
'Force management statements'
https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/about-us/what-we-do/integrated-peel-assessments/force-management-statements/

HMICFRS
'Police inspection programme and framework'
https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/wp-content/uploads/hmicfrs-inspection-programme-2018-19.pdf

Home Office
'Police forces save £273 million in three years on equipment cost'
https://www.gov.uk/government/news/police-forces-save-273-million-in-three-years-on-equipment-cost

Home Office
'Crime outcomes in England and Wales, year to December 2017: data tables'
https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/crime-outcomes-in-england-and-wales-year-to-december-2017-data-tables

Home Office
'Fire and rescue incident statistics: England, year ending December 2017'
https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/fire-and-rescue-incident-statistics-england-year-ending-december-2017

HMICFRS
'Developing the fire and rescue service inspections'
https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/publications/developing-fire-rescue-service-inspections/

Home Office
'Updated Fire and Rescue National Framework for England'
https://www.gov.uk/government/news/updated-fire-and-rescue-national-framework-for-england

Home Office
'Government announces new standards for fire and rescue services'
https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-announces-new-standards-for-fire-and-rescue-services

MHCLG
'Independent Review of Building Regulations and Fire Safety'
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/independent-review-of-building-regulations-and-fire-safety-final-report

Home Office
'Enabling police and crime commissioners to sit and vote on combined fire and rescue authorities'
https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/enabling-police-and-crime-commissioners-to-sit-and-vote-on-combined-fire-and-rescue-authorities

National Fire Chiefs Council
'New hub now up and running for emergency services to share information'
https://www.nationalfirechiefs.org.uk/News/new-hub-now-up-and-running-for-emergency-services-to-share-information-/201322

For more information please contact

Daniel Harris
National Head of Emergency Services and Local Government

M +44 (0)7792 948 767
daniel.harris@rsmuk.com

Matthew Humphrey
Partner, Risk advisory

M +44 (0)7711 960 728
matthew.humphrey@rsmuk.com

rsmuk.com